

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/659,312		09/11/2003	Hiroshi Kamada	117110	3586		
25944	7590	04/11/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
OLIFF &	BERRID	GE, PLC	CHAPMAN	CHAPMAN, MARK A			
P.O. BOX ALEXAN		A 22320		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				1756			
				DATE MAILED: 04/11/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					ilh/_					
	Appli	cation No.		Applicant(s)	(*					
Office Action Comments		59,312		KAMADA ET AL.						
Office Action Summary	Exam	iner		Art Unit						
		A. Chapma		1756						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply										
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).										
Status										
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2005.										
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .										
3)☐ Since this application is in condit	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Disposition of Claims										
4a) Of the above claim(s) i 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to	<ul> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.</li> </ul>									
Application Papers										
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.										
<u> </u>	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any c	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.										
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119										
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>										
Attachment(s)										
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)										
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Reviews)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09112003.</li> </ol>			Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal Pa Other:	te atent Application (PTC	<b>≻152)</b>					

Application/Control Number: 10/659,312 Page 2

Art Unit: 1756

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- 2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The ratio of the number of particles having an average circularity or 0.0970 or greater and 0.950 or less cannot be ascertained from the written description. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made could not use or calculate the ratio data.
- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The ratio of the number of particles having an average circularity or 0.0970 or greater and 0.950 or less is vague, indefinite, and confusing. Although it is appreciated by the Examiner that the amounts of particles 0.0970 or greater and 0.950 or less is meant to be low (5% or less and 10% or less, respectively), how this ratio is determined cannot be ascertained from the description. It

Art Unit: 1756

is not clear how the fractional values of "3/5 or less" and "7/5 or greater" are determined and how the ratio is affected, especially by a fractional value that is expressed with the qualifier "or less" and "or greater".

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (6,746,810) in view of each of Yamazaki (6,475,689), Nishimori (6,617,091), and Tomita (2004/0053154). Suzuki (claims) teaches a replenishing toner image formation method and related applications. Suzuki teaches a similar toner have the same size and a particular shape coefficient (col. 9 and col. 26-29). Suzuki does not specifically teach the average circularity. Each of Yamazaki (col. 14 lines 35-67), Nishimori (col. 14+), and Tomita (paragraph 69) teach the criticality of toner circularity and related shape. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the direct teachings of Yamazaki, Nishimori, and Tomita as the replenishing toner of Yamazaki because of the known use and effect of such toners as specifically taught by each reference

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Chapman whose telephone number is 571-272-1381. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

Art Unit: 1756

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark A. Chapman Primary Examiner

le A. On

Art Unit 1756

MC